DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 288 PS 015 919

AUTHOR Clark, M. L.; Ayers, Marla
TITLE Friendship Expectations and the Evaluation of Present Friendships: Effects of Reciprocity, Gender and Race.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Blacks; Expectation; *Friendship; Junior High Schools; Junior High School Students; *Predictor Variables; *Racial Differences; Sex Differences; *Whites

ABSTRACT

The relationship between friendship expectations, assessment of present friendships, and friendship satisfaction, as well as the degree to which friends were similar on these variables were investigated for black and white adolescents. Subjects were 150 eighth-grade students from a public school in the southeastern United States. Fifty-six students were black (24 males, 32 females) and 94 were white (48 males, 46 female). Four areas of friendship expectations and friendship assessments were measured: mutual activities, conventional morality, empathic understanding, and loyalty and commitment. Friendship expectations and the assessment of present friendships were correlated with each other. Satisfaction with present friends could be predicted for females from knowledge about the level of mutual activity and empathic understanding in their present friendships, for males from their assessment of loyalty and commitment in their present friendships, for black adolescents from the rating of empathic understanding in their actual friends, and for white adolescents from the mutual activities shared with friends. Females expected and reported more conventional morality and empathic understanding from their friends than did males. Friendship dyads were formed and classified according to the level of dyad reciprocity and the gender and racial composition of the dyad. White dyads were more similar than black dyads on their friendship expectancies in the areas of conventional morality and empathic understanding. Results are discussed in terms of Bigelow and La Gaipa's theory of friendship expectations. Nineteen references and four statistical tables are included. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272288

Friendship Expectations and the Evaluation of Present Friendships: Effects of Reciprocity, Gender and Race

M. L. Clark

Wake Forest University

Marla Ayers

Memphis State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. L. Clark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 015919

Running head: FRIENDSHIP EXPECTATIONS

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1986.

Abstract

The relationship between friendship expectations, assessment of present friendships, and friendship satisfaction, and the degree to which friends were similar on these variables were investigated for black and white adolescents. Four areas of friendship expectations and friendship assessments were measured: mutual activities, conventional morality, empathic understanding, and loyalty and commitment. Friendship expectations and the assessment of present friendships were correlated with each other. Satisfaction with present friends could be predicted for females from knowledge about the level of mutual activity and empathic understanding in their present friendships, for males from their assessment of loyalty and commitment in their present friendships, for black adolescents from the rating of empathic understanding in their actual friends, and for white adolescents from the mutual activities shared with friends. Females expected and reported more conventional morality and empathic understanding from their friends than males. Friendship dyads were formed and classified according to the level of dyad reciprocity and the gender and racial composition of the dyad. White dyads were more similar than black dyads on their friendship expectancies in the areas of conventional morality and empathic understanding. The results are discussed in terms of Bigelow and La Gaipa's theory of friendship expectations.

Friendship Expectations and the Evaluation of Present Friendships: Effects of Reciprocity, Gender and Race

Bigelow and La Gaipa (1980) proposed that children and adolescents develop expectations and notions about the qualities that friends should possess and are attracted to and befriend those who meet these expectations. Young children expect friends to participate in mutual activities, older children expect friends to be nice and kind and adolescents expect loyalty, commitment and empathy from friends. The developmental stages of friendship expectations progress from egocentric and concrete expectations to empathic and abstract expectations (Bigelow & La Gaipa, 1980; Selman, 1977; Smollar & Youniss, 1982).

Friendship expectations were assessed by Bigelow and La Gaipa (1975) by asking children in the first through the eighth grades to write an essay describing the behaviors and qualities that they expected from their best friends. These essays were content analyzed and resulted in 16 friendship dimensions that were further reduced to those nine dimensions that appeared to show ordinality in the grade level of their onset (i.e., the first grade level at which the dimension occurs). These dimensions were loosely grouped into 3 stages that progressed from an emphasis on common activities, and propinquity (Stage 1) to character admiration (Stage 2) to a concern with loyalty and commitment, empathy, and intimacy potential (Stage 3).

These friendship expectancy dimensions were thought to form an additive model, that is, as age increases children do not discard previous friendship expectations but instead acquire new expectations that begin to dominate their cognitions about friends. The model was also viewed as universal. Bigelow and La Gaipa (1980) reasoned that if universal sequencing occurs in cognitive development it should also be applicable to friendship expectations which are social cognitions. Although the assumption that social cognitions become more complex with advances in general cognition is reasonable, the nature of the social cognitions acquired will depend upon the cultural values prevalent in one's environment. Thus, one might expect that those who vary in their cultural orientations may also vary in the qualities they find important in friends. Whether the dimensions found in the present friendship theories reflect the friendship expectations of minority adolescents has not been explored.

Sex differences in friendship expectations have not always been consistent and depend on the age level studied. The most frequent finding is that during late adolescence females expect more intimacy and self-disclosure from their best friends and thus are at a more advanced developmental level of friendship expectations than males (La Gaipa, 1977). These differences are not often found for early adolescent populations who have just

begun to see intimacy potential as an important quality in a friend. Bigelow and La Gaipa (1980) reported few sex differences in friendship expectations during middle childhood and early adolescence. Biddle and Clark (1986), however, found sex differences in the expectation of empathic understanding during middle childhood; girls expected more empathic understanding than boys. Additional research is needed to explore possible gender patterns.

Only a few studies have investigated whether friends have similar friendship expectations. Bigelow and La Gaipa (1980) designed two studies to determine if children select friends with similar friendship expectations. Their findings from a study using hypothetical friends were contrary to this notion. The friendship expectancy level of each child was assessed and they were then presented with tape recordings of friendship expectancy statements determined to be above, below, or at the subject's same expectancy level. Each child was then asked to choose the bogus peer that they would like to have as a best friend based on the recorded statements they heard. Only 4 out of 31 children selected hypothetical friends who were at the same friendship expectation level.

In a different study by the same researchers, children's developmental level of friendship expectations were compared with the developmental level of their actual best friend. Forty-four

percent of the children named as their best friend a child that was at a similar friendship level. In addition, the developmental level of children in reciprocal (mutual selection) and nonreciprocal (unilateral selection) dyads were compared but no significant differences were found. Contrary to this latter finding, Ayers (1985) found that reciprocal friendship dyads and female dyads were more similar to their friends in their expectations regarding mutual activities than nonreciprocal and male dyads.

Studies that compare friendship expectations with the evaluations of present friendships are rare. These studies are needed to determine if adolescents are really getting what they expect from their friendships. One such study did report a significant relationship between friendship expectations and the evaluation of present friendships for early adolescents (Ayers, 1985). Studies that focus on the relationship between friendship satisfaction and friendship expectations, are also scarce. The study of adolescent friendship satisfaction has been limited to late adolescent and college populations and has centered around the relationship between friendship satisfaction and either similarity to friends or the perception of rewards and costs existing in a friendship (Knapp & Harwood, 1977; Rusbult, 1980). The level of satisfaction associated with a relationship may be a function of the difference between what one expects and what one is actually getting from a friendship.

The present study had three purposes. First, the relationships between friendship expectations, assessment of present friendships, friendship satisfaction, and friendship reciprocity were investigated. Second, the study assessed gender and racial differences in the amount of time spent with friends (friendship proximity), satisfaction with friends (friendship satisfaction), criteria used to select friends (friendship expectations), the evaluations of present friends (friendship assessment), and the number of reciprocal friends. Finally, the study assessed whether similarity to best friends in the areas of friendship expectations, friendship satisfaction and the evaluation of present best friends differed as a function of the reciprocity, race, and gender of the friendship dyad.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 150 eighth graders (72 males, 78 females) from a public school located in the Southeast. Fifty-six students were black (24 males, 32 females) and 94 white (48 male, 46 female). Ninety-three percent of all eighth grade students attending the school participated.

Measures

Four measures were administered to gather information on adolescent friendships: the Sociometric Questionnaire; the modified Children's Friendship Expectancy Inventory; the Friendship Assessment Inventory; and the Satisfaction and Commitment Scale. Each scale is described in more detail below.

Sociometric Questionnaire. The Sociometric Questionnaire was constructed to gather information on friendship selection, adolescent activities and interests, friendship reciprocity, friendship proximity, and selected demographics. The first questions asked about the sex, race, and grade level of the subject. Subjects were then asked to indicate the clubs, sports, and/or hobbies in which they participate. Their responses were then compared to those of their best friends to determine the number of mutual interests shared with best friends. A mean mutual interest score was then calculated.

Subjects were asked to list in rank order their three same-sex, same-grade best friends who were attending their present school. This data was used in two ways. First, reciprocal dyads (consisting of mutual, two-way friendship selection) and nonreciprocal dyads (consisting of nonmutual, one-way friendship selection) were identified by this sociometric information. Second, the total number of reciprocal friendship choices received were calculated for each subject, the score ranged from 0 to 3. Subjects were then asked to indicate for each friend listed the number of classes and clubs shared with the friend, and the number of days each week spent with each friend outside of school. A friendship proximity variable was constructed by combining the responses to these questions. High scores indicate that subjects have alot of contact with their friends and low scores indicate that the subject has little contact with friends. A separate

score was calculated for each of the three best friends listed and then a mean friendship proximity score was calculated.

Children's Friendship Expectancy Inventory. Friendship expectations were assessed by a modified version of the Children's Friendship Expectancy Inventory (La Gaipa & Wood, 1973). The inventory was developed by writing items to assess the nine dimensions of friendship expectations identified by Bigelow and La Gaipa (1975) and administering them to students from the sixth through the eighth grades. This data was then factor analyzed to form the final scale which included four major friendship expectancy areas. The inventory consists of twenty-eight behaviors or qualities that could exist in friendships; seven statements are included from each of the following four expectancy areas: conventional morality (e.g., Do not lie or cheat), mutual activities (e.g., Go places together), empathic understanding (e.g., Can talk about my personal problems), and loyalty and commitment (e.g., Are loyal to me). Subjects decide how important each behavior or quality is to them in choosing friends. The original scale was modified by changing the ranking response mode to a Likert scale (1 = not important, 5 = very important).

A separate score was calculated for each of the four expectancy areas with high scores indicating that the area is important to the subject in choosing friends. A total score was also calculated; high scores indicate that subjects expected alot

from their friends. Ayers (1985) gathered test-retest data on this modified Children's Expectancy Inventory for 41 high school students with a one week test-retest interval. The reliability coefficients are as follows: conventional morality, .57; mutual activities, .66; empathic understanding, .47; and loyalty and commitment, .67. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from .63 (loyalty and commitment) to .87 (empathic understanding).

Friendship Assessment Inventory. The Friendship Assessment Inventory (Ayers, 1985) was administered to determine the behaviors and qualities that exist in each subject's present friendships. A variation of the original expectancy inventory, the Friendship Assessment Inventory consists of the same twenty-eight items found in the original expectancy inventory with two major alterations. The instructions of the expectancy inventory were changed to reflect that the students were now being asked to assess their present friendships instead of indicating what they expected from their friends. The statements were then reworded to focus on the evaluation of best friends instead of factors that are important in choosing best friends.

Four scores were obtained from the Friendship Assessment Inventory: conventional morality assessment (e.g., They do not lie or cheat), mutual activity assessment (e.g., We can talk about my personal problems), loyalty and commitment assessment (e.g., They are loyal to me) and empathic understanding (e.g., They help

me when I'm in trouble). High scores indicate that the behaviors in that area often occur in the subject's friendships. Test-retest reliability coefficients for this measure are as follows: conventional morality, .62; mutual activities, .72; empathic understanding, .88; and loyalty and commitment, .89 (Ayers, 1985). Cronbach's alphas range from .69 (mutual activity) to .85 (empathic understanding) for a junior high school sample (Ayers, 1985).

Satisfaction and Commitment Scale. Friendship satisfaction was assessed by the satisfaction subscale from the Satisfaction and Commitment Scale (Solano & Ayers, 1983). This scale consists of twenty statements--ten measuring satisfaction with present friendships (e.g., I feel good about my best friends) and ten measuring commitment to present friendships (e.g., My best friends and I will probably be friends for a long time). Subjects, thinking of the three best friends located on the Sociometric Questionnaire, respond to each statement by using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each item. The satisfaction score is calculated by summing the responses to the 10 satisfaction questions. Only the friendship satisfaction score was used in the present study. The higher the score the greater the satisfaction with friends. The satisfaction subscale was shown to have a test-retest reliability coefficient of .49 for a

sample of tenth grade students when the test-retest interval was one and one-half weeks (Solano & Ayers, 1983). A Cronbach's alpha was reported as .88 for a junior high school sample (Ayers, 1985).

Procedure

Students were tested in their language-social studies block by a trained examiner in two separate sessions. The modified Children's Expectancy Inventory was given in the first session which lasted for 10 minutes. A week later the Sociometric Questionnaire, Friendship Assessment Inventory, and Satisfaction and Commitment Scale were administered in a 30 minute session. In both sessions the experimenter read aloud the instructions and items in each questionnaire allowing subjects time to respond as the items were read.

Results

Relationship Between Friendship Variables

Correlational Relationships. The relationship between friendship expectations, friendship assessments, friendship satisfaction, friendship proximity, and the number of reciprocal friends was determined by calculating Pearson product-moment correlations between these variables for the total group, and separately by sex and race; the coefficients appear in Table 1. Friendship expectations were positively correlated with the assessment of present friends for each of the subareas. This pattern of relationships did not differ by gender or race.

Insert Table 1 about here

The number of reciprocal friends was correlated with conventional morality expectancy, $r = .34$, $p < .001$; and empathic understanding expectancy, $r = .27$, $p < .01$ for white adolescents. These relationships were not significant for black, female, or male adolescents. The number of reciprocal friends was also correlated with the assessment of present friends for each of the four areas measured (mutual activity, conventional morality, loyalty and commitment, empathic understanding) for the female and white adolescents. For black adolescents the number of reciprocal friends was correlated with only the assessment of empathic understanding, $r = .27$, $p < .02$; no significant correlations occurred for male adolescents.

The above variables along with the number of reciprocal friends and those variables assessing proximity or contact with best friends were correlated with friendship satisfaction (see Table 2). Again these correlations were calculated for the total

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

sample and by race and sex. The relationship between friendship expectations and satisfaction with present friends was dependent

upon gender, race and the area of friendship expectancy measured. There was a positive correlation between level of friendship satisfaction and mutual activity expectancy, $r = .19$, $p < .05$, loyalty and commitment expectancy, $r = .20$, $p < .05$, and empathic understanding expectancy, $r = .34$, $p < .01$, for females but no significant relationships existed for males. Satisfaction with friends was positively correlated with the loyalty commitment expectancy score, $r = .22$, $p < .05$, for black students and the conventional morality, $r < .21$, $p < .05$, and empathic understanding, $r = .27$, $p < .01$, expectancy scores for white subjects. Friendship satisfaction was positively correlated with all areas of friendship assessment. The number of reciprocated best friends was correlated with satisfaction with friends for only the white students.

The mean number of classes that the students shared with their three best friends was negatively correlated with friendship satisfaction for the total sample, $r = -.16$, $p < .05$. When looking at the subgroup analyses this relationship was significant for males, $r = -.22$, $p < .05$, and white students, $r = -.27$, $p < .01$. As the number of classes shared with friends increased the level of friendship satisfaction decreased for these subgroups. The amount of time spent with best friends outside of school was positively correlated with the level of friendship satisfaction. As contact outside of school increased, satisfaction with friends

also increased. The relationship existed for all subgroups except the black students.

Predictors of Friendship Satisfaction. To determine the variables that best predict an individual's friendship satisfaction, multiple regression coefficients were calculated. The predictor variables were the scores from the Friendship Expectancy Inventory, Friendship Assessment Inventory, Friendship Satisfaction subscale, interests shared with friends, Friendship proximity to friends (e.g., in class, clubs, outside of school) and the number of reciprocal friends. Separate regression coefficients were calculated for male, female, black and white students.

The following two significant predictors of friendship satisfaction were found for the total sample: mutual activity assessment and empathic understanding assessment $R = .54$, $R^2 = .28$. The predictors varied for the subgroup analyses. Those variables that predicted friendship satisfaction for males were not predictors for females. The loyalty and commitment assessment score, was a significant predictor for males $R^2 = .50$, $R = .25$. There were three predictors of friendship satisfaction for females: mutual activity assessment (beta - .29), empathic understanding assessment (beta = .32) and the number of clubs shared with friends (beta = -.20), $R = .56$, $R^2 = .29$. The predictors of friendship satisfaction for the black and white

students also differed. Mutual activity assessment was a significant predictor of satisfaction with friends for whites, R = .62, R^2 = .38, whereas empathic understanding assessment was the sole predictor for the black students, R = .36, R^2 = .11. the friendship expectations scores were not significant predictors of friendship satisfaction.

Insert Table 3 about here

Race and Gender Differences on the Friendship Variables

A series of two-way MANOVAs were calculated on selected subgroups of the dependent variables. A 2 (Sex) x 2 (Race) MANOVA was conducted with the four friendship expectancy scores as the dependent variable. A significant sex difference was found for the friendship expectancy scores, $F(4, 131) = 10.10$, $p < .001$; means are presented in Table 4. The univariate F tests indicated

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

that the sex difference was limited to the areas of conventional morality $F(1, 134) = 11.66$, $p < .001$ and empathic understanding, $F(1, 134) = 31.61$, $p < .001$. For both areas the females had higher scores than the males.

A 2 (Sex) x 2 (race) MANOVA was computed for the four assessment scores. There was a significant sex difference, $F(4, 138) = 4.42$, $p < .002$ and a sex by race interaction, $F(4, 138) = 2.76$, $p < .03$. Based on the univariate F tests, the sex difference was limited to the areas of conventional morality, $F(1, 141) = 12.82$, $p < .001$ and empathic understanding, $F(1, 141) = 12.75$, $p < .001$. Females reported more conventional morality and empathic understanding from their best friends than males. The sex by race interaction was significant for all four areas of friendship assessment. The white females had higher scores than the white males in the areas of mutual activities, conventional morality and empathic understanding. The black males ($\bar{X} = 28.08$), however, had higher scores than the white males ($\bar{X} = 24.95$) and black females ($\bar{X} = 26.59$) on the area of loyalty and commitment.

A similar MANOVA was computed with the mutual interest variables (i.e., similar interest in sports and hobbies) and the number of reciprocal friends as dependent variables. A significant sex difference was found, $F(3, 138) = 18.48$, $p < .001$. According to the univariate F-tests the sex difference existed for the following variables, number of sports shared with friends, $F(1, 140) = 33.60$, $p < .001$, number of hobbies shared with friends, $F(1, 140) = 4.48$, $p < .04$, and the number of reciprocal friends, $F(1, 140) = 8.38$, $p < .01$. Males had a greater number of sports interests that were identical to their

best friends ($\bar{X}$ = 6.18) than females ($\bar{X}$ = 3.96). Females ($\bar{X}$ = 4.08) had a greater number of hobbies that were identical to their friends than males ($\bar{X}$ = 3.44). Finally, females had a larger number of reciprocal friends ($\bar{X}$ = 1.53) than males ($\bar{X}$ = 1.03). A significant race effect was found for the number of reciprocal friends, $F(1, 140) = 11.02$, $p < .001$; white adolescents ($\bar{X}$ = 1.55) had more reciprocal friends than the black adolescents ($\bar{X}$ = 1.01).

The last 2 (Sex) x 2 (Race) MANOVA was computed on those variables designed to give information about the amount of contact with best friends (i.e., number of classes and clubs shared with friends and the amount of time spent outside of school with friends). A main effect for sex was found, $F(3, 144) = 4.50$, $p < .01$. Based on the univariate F tests, the sex difference existed for the number of clubs shared with friends, $F(1, 146) = 5.29$, $p < .05$, and the number of days spent with friends outside of school, $F(1, 146) = 13.17$, $p < .001$. Males spent more time outside of school with best friends ($\bar{X}$ = 3.88 days per week) than females ($\bar{X}$ = 2.39) and males were in more clubs with their best friends ($\bar{X}$ = .95) than females ($\bar{X}$ = .27).

Friendship Similarity

Based on the three friends listed on the Sociometric Questionnaire, friendship dyads were identified and categorized as reciprocal or nonreciprocal. Reciprocal dyads consist of those

with mutual selection, that is both members of the dyad named each other as friends. Nonreciprocal dyads consist of those with nonmutual selection in which only one member of the dyad named the other as a friend. In addition, friendship dyads were classified by gender as either same-sex male or same-sex female and by race as same-race white or same-race black. Most children appeared in more than one dyad which necessitated randomly selecting dyads so that each child appeared only once. Based on this classification system, there were 52 dyads, 32 reciprocal, 20 nonreciprocal. Twenty-one dyads were same-sex male, 31 were same-sex female; 30 were same-race white and 22 were same-race black.

Dyad difference scores were calculated for each friendship dyad for the following variables: friendship expectancy, friendship assessment and friendship satisfaction. A 2 (dyad type: reciprocal, nonreciprocal) x 2 (dyad sex: male, female) x 2 (dyad race: black, white) MANOVA was calculated on the dyad difference scores for the friendship expectancy measure. There was a main effect for dyad race, $\underline{F}(4, 47) = 2.50$, $\underline{p} < .05$. The univariate $\underline{F}$s showed the effect to be significant for conventional morality, $\underline{F}(1, 50) = 4.79$, $\underline{p} < .05$ and empathic understanding, $\underline{F}(1, 50) = 5.80$, $\underline{p} < .05$. In both cases the white dyads were more similar than the black dyads. A similar MANOVA was conducted on the friendship assessment scores but no significant main effects or interactions were found. Reciprocal dyads were no more similar

than nonreciprocal dyads in the way they assessed their present friendships. In addition there were no differences based on the sex or race of the dyad. Finally, a 2 (reciprocity) x 2 (dyad sex) x 2 (dyad race) ANOVA was calculated on the friendship satisfaction dyad difference scores. There were no differences in the level of similarity of friends as a function of sex, race or reciprocity level of the dyad.

Discussion

The first purpose of the present study was to explore the relationships between the friendship variables. Bigelow and La Gaipa (1980) suggested that friendship expectations should guide the friendship selection process. The correlational data are supportive of this notion. Friendship expectations were positively related to the adolescents' assessment of present friendships. These adolescents, regardless of race or gender, were involved with peers who had the qualities that they perceived as essential for a good friendship.

Although friendship expectations were correlated with the adolescents' assessments of their present friends, these two variables were differentially related to satisfaction with friends. For the overall sample, friendship expectations were not correlated with the adolescent's satisfaction with friends. A few correlations for specific friendship qualities were significant for various subgroups. For example, the females who were most

satisfied with their friends expected to share mutual activities with and receive empathic understanding and loyalty and commitment from their best friends; no such pattern emerged for males. The most satisfied white adolescents were those who expected their friends to possess empathic understanding and conventional morality. The most satisfied black adolescents were those who expected loyalty and commitment from their friends. These findings suggest that gender and race are important in determining which friendship cognitions will directly influence one's satisfaction with friends.

The level of satisfaction with best friends was closely related to the adolescents' assessment of the qualities that existed in their friends. This was true regardless of race, gender, or the type of quality assessed (e.g., conventional morality or empathic understanding). Some qualities were more important in predicting friendship satisfaction than others. The best predictor of friendship satisfaction for the males was the amount of loyalty and commitment reported in their present friendships. This finding is contrary to the previous finding that females expect more commitment from their relationships than males (Berndt, 1982; Crockett, Losoff, & Petersen, 1984; Karweit & Hansell, 1983). This contradiction may be accounted for by the finding that black males reported more loyalty and commitment in their friendships than the black females.

Females who were most satisfied with their friends reported receiving alot of empathic understanding from them and sharing a number of mutual activities with friends. The friendship expectancy theories suggest that more value is placed on empathic understanding and loyalty and commitment than on mutual activities or conventional morality during adolescence (see Bigelow & La Gaipa, 1980; Selman & Selman, 1979; Smollar & Youniss, 1982). Our findings partially support this developmental pattern but deviate by the greater than expected importance placed on the sharing of mutual activities by the females.

Mutual activities were most important in determining the level of friendship satisfaction of white adolescents, whereas, the amount of empathic understanding possessed by friends was most important for the black students. In addition, the level of friendship satisfaction for white adolescents could be predicted more accurately than that for black adolescents. These findings should caution us that data from studies assessing the satisfaction levels of white populations (Hayes, 1978; Knapp & Harwood, 1977) may not generalize to other minority groups. In the present study, however, there was no attempt to control for social class, thus racial differences may be confounded with social class differences.

The second purpose of this study was to look for racial and gender differences in the mean scores of the friendship

variables. Sex differences were more prevalent than race differences. Females expected more conventional morality and empathic understanding from their friends than males. These findings might suggest that females may have more complex expectations of the important qualities necessary for friends than males. The findings are also consistent with the past findings that from preadolescence through adulthood females have a greater expectancy of empathic understanding than males (Eder & Hallinan, 1987; Hartup, 1982; Richey & Richey, 1980) and females empathize more than males (Kurdek & Krile, 1982).

In addition to expecting more conventional morality and empathic understanding from friends than males, females reported these qualities as present in their actual friendships more often than males. This finding is consistent with data from Sharabany, Gershoni and Hofman (1981) who found that females (grades 5, 7, 9) reported more sensitivity and frankness in their friendships than males.

Sex differences also occurred on the mutual interest variables. Male friends were more likely to have similar sports interests than female friends, however, the hobbies of females were more similar than those of males. This finding can partly be explained by males being interested in more sports than females who were instead involved in more hobbies than males. Sex differences also occurred on the friendship proximity variables.

Males tended to spend more time outside of school with their friends than females.

White adolescents had more reciprocated friendship choices than black adolescents. This finding is consistent with previous studies (Ayers & Clark, 1985; Hallinan, 1982). The race difference is partly a function of the black-white ratio in the school. The black students had fewer same-race peers from which to choose their best friends than their white counterparts.

All other race differences did not occur in the absence of sex differences. The interactions were limited to the evaluations of the present friends. The white females reported more mutual activities, conventional morality, and empathic understanding present in their actual friendships than the white males; no differences occurred for the black males and females. The black males, however, reported more loyalty and commitment in their relationships than the black females; this sex difference was absent for the white adolescents.

The final purpose of the present study was to assess whether friendship similarity in the areas of friendship expectations, evaluations, and satisfaction level varied as a function of the reciprocity, race, and gender of the friendship dyad.. Reciprocal dyads were no more similar in their friendship expectations or the way they assessed their present friendships than nonreciprocal dyads. This finding is consistent with previous research (Ayers,

1985; Bigelow & La Gaipa, 1980). The only significant finding was that white friends were more similar than black friends on the level of conventional morality and empathic understanding they expected from their best friends.

In summary, friendship cognitions were important for selecting and evaluating friends. These cognitions directly affected the satisfaction received from friends for some subgroups; however, friendship satisfaction was more closely associated with the evaluation of desirable characteristics in existing friends. The variables that predicted friendship satisfaction differed according to sex and race and predictors were more accurate for white than black adolescents. Gender patterns were more prevalent than racial patterns in the areas of friendship expectations, contact with friends and mutual interests. Sex by race interactions, however, were consistently found for the adolescents' evaluations of their present friends. Enough race differences occurred that we should be cautious of generalizing the major friendship theories to minority adolescents without proper validation.

References

Ayers, M. (1985). Friendship expectations and real-life friendships. Unpublished master's thesis. Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC.

Berndt, T. (1982). The features and effects of friendship in early adolescence. Child Development, 53, 1447-1460.

Biddle, M., & Clark, M. (1986, March). Friendship expectations and the assessment of present friendships. Paper to be presented at the Southeastern Psychological Association, Orlando, Florida.

Bigelow, B., & La Gaipa, J. (1975). Children's written descriptions of friendship: A multidimensional analysis. Developmental Psychology, 11, 857-858.

Bigelow, B., & La Gaipa, J. (1980). The development of friendship values and choice. In H. Foot, A. Chapman, & J. Smith (Eds.), Friendship and social relations in children (pp. 15-44). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Crockett, L., Losoff, M., & Petersen, A. (1984). Perceptions of the peer group and friendship in early adolescence. Journal of Early Adolescence, 4, 155-181.

Eder, D., & Hallinan, M. (1978). Sex differences in children's friendships. American Sociological Review, 43, 237-250.

Karweit, N., & Hansell, S. (1983). Sex differences in adolescent relationships: Friendships and status. In J. Epstein & N. Karweit (Eds.), Friends in school: Patterns of selection and influence in secondary schools (pp. 115-130). New York: Academic Press.

Knapp, C., & Harwood, B. (1977). Factors in the determination of intimate same-sex friendship. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 131, 83-90.

Kurdek, L., & Krile, D. (1982). A developmental analysis of the relationship between peer acceptance and both interpersonal understanding and perceived social self-competence. Child Development, 53, 1485-1491.

La Gaipa, J., & Wood, H. (1973). The perception of friendship by socially accepted and rejected children. Paper read at the meting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

La Gaipa, J. (1977). Testing a multidimensional approach to friendship. In S. Duck (Ed.), Theory and practice in interpersonal attraction. London: Academic Press.

Richey, M., & Richey, H. (1980). The significance of best-friend relationships in adolescence. Psychology in the Schools, 17, 536-540.

Rusbult, C. (1980). Satisfaction and commitment in friendships. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 11, 96-105.

Selman, R. (1977). A structural-developmental model of social cognition; implications for intervention research. Counseling Psychologist, 6, 3-6.

Selman, R., & Selman, A. (1979). Children's ideas about friendship: A new theory. Psychology Today, 71-80 & 114.

Sharabany, R., Gershoni, R., & Hofman, J. (1981). Girlfriend, boyfriend: Age and sex differences in intimate friendship. Developmental Psychology, 17, 800-808.

Smollar, J., & Youniss, J. (1982). Social development through friendship. In K. Rubin & H. Ross (Eds.), Peer relationships and social skills in childhood. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Solano, C., & Ayers, M. (1983). Satisfaction, commitment, and similarity in adolescent friendships. Unpublished manuscript, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC.

Table 1

Correlations between Expectancy and Assessment Scores by Sex and Race

	Friendship Assessment				
Friendship Expectancy	Males	Females	Blacks	Whites	Total
Mutual Activities	.45	.23*	.42	.31**	.34
Conventional Morality	.63	.26**	.47	.52	.49
Loyalty & Commitment	.50	.47	.58	.44	.50
Empathic Understanding	.46	.51	.50	.58	.53
Total Score	.61	.54	.70	.55	.61
n	59	75	53	80	135

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$,

Note. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$ except for those indicated to be significant at another level. All subjects were not included in these analyses because of incomplete data.

Table 2

Correlations Between Friendship Satisfaction and the other Friendship Variables

	Friendship Satisfaction				
	Males	Females	Blacks	Whites	Total
Expectancy					
Mutual Activity	.04	.19*	.16	.10	.15
Conventional Morality	.20	.17	.21	.21*	.15
Loyalty-Commitment	.10	.20*	.22*	.14	.15
Empathic Understanding	.02	.34**	.15	.27**	.20
Assessment					
Mutual Activity	.52***	.48***	.30**	.63***	.51***
Conventional Morality	.40***	.28**	.30**	.43***	.37***
Loyalty-Commitment	.53***	.41***	.36**	.56***	.49***
Empathic Understanding	.49***	.47***	.40***	.55***	.50***
Reciprocal Friends	.06	.10	-.04	.24**	.12
Proximity Contact					
Classes	-.22*	-.10	-.00	-.27**	-.16*
Clubs	.10	-.16	-.04	.07	.01
Days per week	.23*	.23*	.11	.21*	.17*
n	67	77	56	87	145

Note. The total number of subjects in several analyses varied as a result of some subjects with missing data.

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 3

Multiple Regression Coefficients for Friendship Satisfaction by Sex and Race

Predictors	Beta	t	R	R^2
Total Sample				
MA Assessment	.32	3.29***		
EU Assessment	.27	2.84**		
			.54	.28
Males				
LC Assessment	.50	4.36***	.50	.25
Females				
MA Assessment	.29	2.35*		
EU Assessment	.32	2.59**		
No. Clubs Shared	-.20	-2.03*		
			.56	.29
Whites				
MA Assessment	.62	6.97***	.62	.38
Blacks				
EU Assessment	.36	2.76**	.36	.11

Note. MA = Mutual Activity, EU = Empathic Understanding, LC = Loyalty and Commitment

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 4

Individual Means of Friendship Variables, by Sex and Race

	Sex		Race	
	Male	Female	White	Black
Expectancy				
Mutual Activity	25.22	25.42	25.20	25.44
Conventional Morality	28.59	30.49***	28.83	30.24
Loyalty-Commitment	25.11	26.28	29.50	29.12
Empathic Understanding	27.60	31.02***	25.79	25.61
Assessment				
Mutual Activity	27.80	28.59	28.44	27.95
Conventional Morality	26.75	28.86***	27.87	27.73
Loyalty-Commitment	26.52	27.23	26.41	27.34
Empathic Understanding	28.10	30.30***	28.96	29.47
Reciprocal Friends	1.03	1.53***	1.55	1.01***
Mutual Interests				
Sports	6.18	3.96***	5.14	5.00
Hobbies	3.44	4.08*	3.88	3.63
Proximity-Contact				
Clubs	.95	.27*	.71	.50
Days per week	3.88	2.39***	3.02	3.24
n	67	77	89	56

Note. The total number of subjects in several analyses varied as a result of some subjects with missing data.

*$p < .05$, ***$p < .001$